



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,714	01/18/2002	Felice Lavecchia	R23-003	1379

7590 01/30/2003

R. Neil Sudol
Coleman Sudol Sapone, P.C.
714 Colorado Avenue
Bridgeport, CT 06605-1601

EXAMINER

LAI, ANNE VIET NGA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2632

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/052,714

Applicant(s)

LAVECCHIA ET AL.

Examiner

Anne V. Lai

Art Unit

2632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-11, 14, 16, 17 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 8, 12, 13, 15 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because:

Reference character "22" has been used to designate both "switches" in fig. 3 and fig. 5 and "infrared sensor" in fig. 7,

Reference character "23" has been used to designate both "operational amplifier" in fig. 5 and "infrared receiver" in fig. 7,

Reference character "24" has been used to designate both "zener diode" in fig. 5 and "infrared transmitter" in fig. 7,

Reference character "25" has been used to designate both "condenser" in fig. 5 and "infrared emitter" in fig. 7.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(o), all blocks in figures 4 and 7 should be labeled with descriptive legends.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 6, "a valuable" should be "the valuable"

In claim 9, "and inductor" should be "an inductor"

In p.5 line1, "siren 19" should be "siren 9".

In p.6 line13, "zener diode 14" should be "zener diode 24".

In p.7 line 9, "selector 27" should be "selector 21".

In p.7 line 14, and p.8 lines 1,5 and 8, "sequencer 3" should be "sequencer 30".

In p.8 line 2, "LED 38" should be "LED 41" since character "38" has been used to designate a "zener diode" in p.7 line16 and in Fig. 6.

In p.8 line 4, "LED 46" should be "LED 50" " since character "46" has been used to designate a "transistor" in p.7 line19 and in Fig. 6.

In p.8 line 10, "Fig. 8" should be "Fig. 7" since there is no Fig. 8 in the drawing.

Reference character "22" has been used to designate both "switches" in p.5 l.13 and "infrared sensor" in p.8 l.11.

Reference character "23" has been used to designate both "operational amplifier" in p.6 lines12 and 13 and "infrared receiver" in p.8 l.12.

Reference character "14" has been used to designate both "zener diode" in p.6 l.13 and "transistor" in p. 4 l.16 and l.18.

Reference character "25" has been used to designate both "condenser" in p.6 l.14 and "infrared emitter" in p.8 l14.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Dagle** [US. 3,638,213].

Regarding claim 1, **Dagle** discloses a security device for a valuable case (a cash drawer 180, fig. 3, col. 3, l. 45) having an alarm system (Figs. 1 and 2) connected to a power source 28 and comprising a light responsive means (186, 188) installed in the valuable case and energized by the power source upon control and by a change in environment lighting condition to generate a control signal activating the alarm system.

Regarding claim 2, **Dagle** discloses the security device comprising a key (col. 3, l. 12, col. 4, l. 31) for activating the light responsive means.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2632

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3, 6, 7, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dagle** in view of **Lurkis** [US. 4,101,876].

Regarding claim 3, **Dagle** discloses a security alarm for a valuable case comprising a light responsive means. **Dagle** does not specifically disclose a control means for the light responsive means. **Lurkis** teaches a security alarm for valuable object comprising a light responsive control means (fig. 4 and 5).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement **Lurkis** light responsive control means for **Dagle** security device to control the light responsive means.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, **Lurkis** further teaches the light responsive means (50, 52, in col.6, l.32) comprising a photodiode (col.5, l. 42) as luminosity levels sensor.

Regarding claim 14, **Lurkis** further shows that the light responsive security device comprising a sequencer (flip-flop 71, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 19, **Lurkis** also suggests a light responsive security device comprising a sensitivity selector (54, 56) for each of the light responsive means (50, 52).

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dagle** in view of **Lekhman** [US. 4,183,019]

Regarding claim 4, **Dagle** does not disclose that the light responsive security device and alarm system for the valuable case having a signal transmitter and receiver. **Lekhman** teaches a security alarm using a signal transmitter unit 19 installed in the

Art Unit: 2632

valuable case and a receiving unit (col. 3, l. 29 and 41) arranged to receive signals transmitted by the transmitter unit.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement **Dagle** security alarm system with **Lekhman** transmitter and receiver to trigger the alarm.

9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dagle** and **Lekhman** in view of **Chesnutt** [US. 5,966,081].

Regarding claim 5, **Dagle** and **Lekhman** do not disclose the claimed satellite transmitter. **Chesnutt** antitheft system suggests a transmitter at a monitoring site could be a satellite transmitter (col. 2, l. 44).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use **Chesnutt** satellite transmitter for **Dagle** and **Lekhman** transmitter to received signal from light responsive security device to generate alarm or monitoring signal.

10. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dagle**, **Lekhman** and **Chesnutt** in view of **Lurkis**.

Regarding claim 9, **Dagle**, **Lekhman** and **Chesnutt** do not specifically disclose the claimed inductor. **Lurkis** teaches a light responsive security device having a control means comprising an inductor 134 generating a magnetic field (Fig. 6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use **Lurkis** control means in **Dagle, Lekhman** and **Chesnutt** security system to control the light responsive security device

11. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dagle** in view of **Diaz-Lopez** [US. 5,694,867].

Regarding claim 10, **Dagle** discloses every limitation except the claimed door locking means. **Diaz-Lopez** suggests an access control security system for bank vault or jewelry store using photocells or infrared presence detector for activating alarm and keeping door locked (col. 11, 12 and col. 18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use **Dagle** light responsive security device to trigger **Diaz-Lopez** access control security system for activating alarm and keeping a door locked.

12. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dagle** in view of **Andrew** [US. 5,757,271].

Regarding claim 11, **Dagle** does not disclose the claimed remotely controlled alarm system. **Andrew** teaches using a portable unit to remotely control the operation of a security alarm device.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement **Andrew** suggestion of a remote control

Art Unit: 2632

alarm system to **Dagle** light responsive security device to remotely activate of the alarm system.

13. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dagle and Lurkis** in view of **Binkley** [US. 4,868,543].

Regarding claims 16 and 17, **Dagle and Lurkis** disclose a light responsive security device for valuable object on display counter lighted by a beam of light, either visible or invisible (col.2, l. 39), and a light sensor for sensing light. **Binkley** suggests the invisible light could be infrared.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use **Binkley** infrared emitter and sensor system in **Dagle and Lurkis** lighting and sensing system to trigger the security alarm.

Conclusion

14. Claims 8, 12-13, 15 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art. Unit: 2632

DeSorbo discloses a remotely armed alarm system. [US. 5,126,719]

Simanowitz discloses a credit card alarm. [US. 4,692,745]

Heller discloses a method and system for locating subjects within a tracking environment. [US. 6,154,139]

Lebensfeld discloses a hide and find toy game. [US. 6,311,982]

Chandar discloses a light sensing hidden object location system. [US. 2003/0001738]

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne V. Lai whose telephone number is 703-305-7925. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am to 6:30 pm, Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Wu can be reached on 703-308-6730. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4800.

A. V. Lai *AVL*
January 27, 2003

[Signature]
DANIEL J. WU
PRIMARY EXAMINER
1/27/03